

they find themselves in an unbearable commute to work or unable to make the necessary connections between home, work, and the other activities that consume our daily lives. North Texas has experienced an increase in traffic over the past 3 decades, which is a result of unprecedented population and employment growth. Added to that is the underinvestment in Federal transportation dollars for my area.

The time is now to make necessary investments in our transportation infrastructure. In Texas, our transportation needs outstrip available funding 3 to 1, and these are not trivial funding needs. These relate to supporting international trade transportation, streamlining the environmental process, and expanding innovative financing techniques. Handling taxpayer dollars with care is, in fact, one of our highest callings in the House of Representatives. That obligation is enshrined in the Constitution. Our charge as congressional representatives is to protect dollars taken from the taxpayer by, in fact, streamlining and improving activities of our Federal Government, not just to simply spend and dispose of those tax dollars. And sadly, when Federal tax dollars are not handled with care, important Federal programs such as our transportation programs find themselves being hurt and neglected.

Last year, shortly after my election to my first term in Congress, I was very fortunate to be chosen to be a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I wanted to be certain that the United States Department of Transportation was ensuring the most efficient business practices within the agency. So I requested a meeting with the Department of Transportation Inspector General, Mr. Kenneth Mead, to discuss the business practices of the agency and how Congress could better facilitate removing inappropriate expenditures related to transportation funding.

□ 2115

The Department of Transportation has not changed the way the agency disburses transportation funding to State and local entities since President Eisenhower was in office. The Inspector General recommended that if one cent had been saved on every dollar spent over the last 10 years in transportation programs, the Department of Transportation would have had an additional \$5 billion to spend.

This \$5 billion would equate to the amount of funding needed for four of the eleven major transportation projects currently under way in this country. Clearly, greater efficiency within DOT could have an enormous impact on more efficiently spending taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Mead shared with me examples of how transportation projects could be used as examples or models of government efficiency. In the State of Utah in preparation for the Winter Olympics, Interstate 15 needed substantial im-

provements. By streamlining the design build process on that stretch of roadway, Interstate Highway 15 in Utah was completed ahead of schedule and under budget and available for individuals traveling to the Winter Olympics that year.

Similarly, in north Texas, the Dallas area rapid transit system worked within their budget last year and actually returned over \$21 million in transit funding to the Federal Government. Unfortunately, there are examples of transportation projects that are not carefully managed; and as a result, dollars are not wisely spent.

The Ted Williams Tunnel of the Central Artery Project in Boston, Massachusetts, known affectionately as the Big Dig, is perhaps the poster child for inefficient Federal spending in a transportation project.

The General Accounting Office has estimated that from fiscal years 1998 through 2001, the Highway Trust Fund Account lost over \$6 billion because of the ethanol tax exemption and the general fund transfer. Using the Department of the Treasury's projection of gasoline tax receipts, the GAO has estimated that the Highway Trust Fund Account will not collect \$13 billion because of the tax exemption from fiscal years 2002 through 2012. There is an almost \$7 billion shortfall from the general fund transfer between the same years.

Prior to the last reauthorization bill in 1998, the Highway trust fund earned interest on its balance, which was paid by the general fund. If the Highway trust fund had continued to earn interest on its balance, the Department of the Treasury estimates that the Highway trust fund would have had an additional \$4 billion from September 1999 through February 2002.

Between modifying DOT's practices within State and local governments and reevaluating the true purposes of the Highway trust fund, I believe we can work together to ensure our Federal Government is more effective and more efficient to the American taxpayer and that we indeed have the funds necessary to pay for our projects.

If we are unwilling to make the monetary investment and the necessary policy changes, I am afraid our vision for our Nation's highways will be that of a congestion-bound commuter sitting in a traffic jam watching the bridges and roadways crumble before our very eyes.

I think, Mr. Speaker, a very worthwhile goal would be to allow Americans to spend as much time in family discussions at the dinner table as they currently spend trying to get home.

TAX CUTS AND THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor of the

House to address the concerns raised by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). But, Mr. Speaker, I just have to respond to some of the comments and debate that I just heard by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

It is interesting to call the Democrats the tax and spend party of America. And I recall that when we finished the work of the 1993 budget resolution and the 1997 budget resolution going into 2001 after President Clinton left office, the spring of 2001 saw this Nation with somewhere between a \$5 and \$7 trillion surplus.

Today as I stand here and on the eve of the Committee on the Budget's meeting tomorrow, addressing the questions of veterans health care and Medicare, Social Security, the threat that this administration has given to cutting Social Security, we are in a \$551 billion deficit based mostly upon very misdirected tax cuts by this administration on the backs of hard-working men and women.

To the 1 percent richest we have given all of the tax cuts, and we are digging a hole deeper than we could ever remove ourselves from and eliminating the needs of all Americans as relates to the services that this government has so aptly done before and having a balanced budget.

So I would just ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to return to their administration and their committee meetings and try to explain to the American people how we have gone down such a slippery slope.

Let me also say that when it comes to the job creation that occurred in the 1990s, this administration and Republican Congress is a dwarf, if you will, compared to the enormous steps and strides that were made under the leadership of the Democrats. 21,000 jobs that were made just in this last month, in terms of job creation, over 3 million manufacturing jobs that have been lost. And the 21,000 jobs were government jobs. No private sector job was made in the last month.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY TOWARD HAITI

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me now move to my comments that are associated with those of Mr. CONYERS. I again ask this administration for full investigation on the removal of a duly elected democratic president from Haiti, President Aristide and his wife.

President Aristide's most recent press conference in the last 24 hours again restates the fact that he was removed from the country without his consent. He was coerced; he was seemingly threatened and frightened into making a decision.

In a hearing that was held last week and questioning Representative U.S. Assistant Secretary Noriega on this question, rather than ask the question directly, he proceeded to be directly rude, if you will, and also to the extent of refusing to answer the question or be

responsive as I would expect a representative of the administration should be.

We now know that thousands of orphans in Haiti are now without food because there is no means of getting food supplies up into the locations where they are. We understand that children have been killed. A young boy who was willing to give his bicycle to one of the thug insurgents was shot dead on the street. Another young boy was injured by a flying canister and lost his life. A Fulbright scholar was fleeing for her life, having to leave the country because of the danger. Thousands of Americans have gone. The U.S. military, specifically the Marines, are in danger because of the refusal to increase the numbers of allied troops on the ground.

It is noted that in 1994 when President Clinton sent 20,000 troops into Haiti to uphold the Santiago Agreement which requires the United States to defend any duly elected democratic government in the western hemisphere, not one military personnel was harmed or was anyone else harmed.

So we know that we have a failure in this policy, we have blood shed in the street, violence in the street, and we have a duly elected president whose supporters are continuing to rebel, if you will, now in exile without any knowledge of his condition or ability to return to a place where he can engage in discussion and be part of a peaceful resolution of installing a peaceful government into Haiti. We have failed in this effort.

It is sad to say that we have not met our goals in Iraq. We have not met our goal in Afghanistan. Now we come full circle to the western hemisphere. Children are starving. People are dying. Violence is raging. No government there for us to negotiate with.

Mr. Speaker, I think for all of us this is on our hands. It is time now for us to stand up and be counted for peace around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HARRIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to talk about the issue of trade. The Bush administration rolled up yet another record for the month of January, and I believe it deserves notice. It is quite an achievement. Our trade deficit widened to \$43.1 billion in January. One month, \$43.1 billion.

Now, they have been telling us for the last year just be patient, the dollar is overvalued, it is going to drop a little bit. And as soon as the dollar drops a little bit, why then, U.S. manufacturers will become more competitive and people will start to buy our goods again.

Well, I had two questions for them. I said what do we make anymore since we are exporting so much of our manufacturing to China? And will it not perhaps mean instead that Americans will buy more expensive goods that are made overseas and that, in fact, our trade deficit will widen? Despite all the Ph.D.s and experts and luminaries they have down there, apparently my concerns have been proven out and not the administration's.

In terms of goods, our deficit went from 44 last year to this year \$48 billion. In terms of services, we had a minor increase of about \$300 million.

So, the fact is we are hollowing out the manufacturing of the United States of the America. There is a new trend where we are hollowing out what was supposed to be the next generation of jobs and intellectual technology, and I will get to that a little bit later.

What does the Bush administration say in reaction to this huge and growing deficit in trade and the debt we are mounting up overseas? China alone, \$124 billion trade deficit last year. China is now the largest foreign holder of United States debt. And they are beginning to acquire assets in the United States of America with the huge pile of dollars they are amassing with this extraordinary trade deficit.

Now, the Bush administration's answer is, well, more of the same, free trade, free trade, free trade. They are unabashed radical, knee-jerk free traders. At least they are consistent. It is good. They went on the attack yesterday saying there are only two choices: the failing trade policies of today, which are hollowing out manufacturing, our industrial base, losing jobs, outsourcing, exporting jobs to other countries, quality jobs, losing the next generation of intellectual technology jobs, jeopardizing, I believe, in the future the security of the United States as more and more critical sectors and technologies are exported overseas.

Just last week in the Wall Street Journal, General Electric, there was an article about how they have sold a

whole \$1 billion worth of turbines to China. There was just a small price they had to pay. It is a state-of-the-art, newly developed turbine, took them half a billion dollars to develop it. The Chinese demanded, in violation of the WTO and rules-based trade, which the Bush administration is such a great fan of, demanded that they give them the technology in exchange for this rather insignificant purchase. Because the technology is going to be worth far, far more; and the Chinese admit they are going to use the technology to build competing turbines. But GE in a very short sighted way decided they would be blackmailed. They were going to give them the technology and get \$1 billion worth of sales. It will look good on this year's balance sheet, but not too good 3 or 5 years from now when the Chinese are eating their lunch internationally using the technology which GE went to so much trouble to develop.

But this is repeated time and time and time again by the Chinese. I have a small company in my district called Videx. They developed a new kind of scanning technology. They developed an electronic lock. They are selling in 44 countries, including, their mistake, China, where they were selling about a \$1 million a year. But it turns out, they say in China if you bring in intellectual property within 24 hours it is counterfeited and for sale.

And the Videx company had followed all the laws and protections, went to the trouble of getting supposed Chinese protection and patents and all that. One day they found their entire company had been cloned in China including their Web site. In fact, the Chinese, the fake Chinese Videx, had gone them one up. They had a little fake American flag waving at the top of their Web site, this Chinese company.

They even copied and translated into Chinese the U.S. copyright and patents on their software. They did not make a very good product, the company found out, because they started getting product support calls from people who thought they were clients of the U.S. Videx, but were actually clients of the phony Chinese Videx. This happens time and time again.

When I went to the Bush administration and asked that perhaps we could get some help, get my two Senators to join me in this for Videx, they are a totally American company, they have 160 employees in my district, they do all of their outsourcing in the United States of America, that is all their subcontracting, not in China, and employ people even in Texas to help build their product, the response, after a lengthy delay from the Bush administration, was that the United States of America will not file intellectual property complaints against China for theft of intellectual property, will not help this relatively small company Videx, because the big corporations, the multinational corporations who are exporting their factories to China would not like that